

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/645,093	Applicant(s) COWAN, KENNETH W.	
	Examiner Eric B. Kiss	Art Unit 2192	

All Participants:

(1) Eric B. Kiss

(2) Anne E. Saturnelli (Reg. No. 41,290)

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 9 March 2007

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1,29,57

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Parties discussed a proposed Examiner's Amendment to place the application in condition for allowance. Specifically, the examiner suggested that the claims submitted by applicant may be unpatentable over discovered prior art describing the concept of configuration testing, and the examiner proposed adding features to the independent claims involving the correlating of the gathered platform configuration data to records of gathered code coverage data such that code coverage could be assessed according to selected platform configurations. Parties discussed applicant's alternative proposal of incorporating the more broad concept of information associated with program executions (rather than specifically code coverage information). The examiner, upon nominal further consideration, suggested that such a proposal may be unpatentable over prior art bug reporting where platform configuration information is collected/reported along with bug information (information associated with program executions). Ms. Saturnelli authorized the originally proposed Examiner's Amendment, and the examiner agreed to cite and briefly describe the discovered prior art..